

Lowering the corporate rate from 35 percent to 20 percent, allowing the repatriation of foreign-made profits, and removing incentives to locate offshore are all positive steps in improving the tax climate for American business. But these positive changes are too costly if the major deductions discussed above are eliminated to pay for these changes. We ask that you work with your colleagues in Congress to keep these deductions intact.

Sincerely,

JEFF ALLRED,  
President & CEO.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize Members for Special Order speeches without prejudice to the resumption of legislative business.

#### BIG DAY FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this has been a big day.

There are so many people who have suffered in this country, especially since the passing of ObamaCare. It is difficult to call it the Affordable Care Act. There is a small percentage that supposedly has done better.

Usually, when my friends across the aisle and most of the media talk about how much better off Americans are under ObamaCare, they ignore the real results, and, instead, they point and say: There are so many people—millions of people now—who have insurance now that didn't have it before.

Well, the reason they could say that was because ObamaCare forced people to buy insurance. We went through this with some family members, helping them make the calculation: should they pay the penalty through additional income tax, or should they buy insurance that they will never, ever be able to use?

On some occasions, you are better off paying the extra tax, which means the government wanted your money a lot worse—well, not worse than the individual—but the government has the power to steal from people and call it legal, and then it is legal.

There was a massive amount of legalized stealing under ObamaCare that took place. This bill we passed today would end so much of the stealing from individuals that the government has been doing legally since ObamaCare passed.

□ 1415

But, yes, there will be millions of people, I would suspect, that when we legally end the individual mandate, they are not going to continue to pay for insurance, huge amounts every month that they can't afford—people

making \$25,000, \$30,000, or so, who couldn't afford to pay for health insurance who were required to do that.

Do you want to pay higher income tax? Are you going to pay for health insurance that you are never going to be able to use? The premiums cost you more than you can afford, the deductible is so high. Clearly, you are young. You are never going to use it. The odds are 99.99 percent you will never use it. But the government forced them to pay more taxes or pay more for insurance they couldn't use.

The good news for those people is that now you will be able to—well, once this becomes the law, and it does need to pass the Senate. The Senate has a little different version, and there are a few things in the Senate version I like better than ours, but there are a lot of things in our bill that I like better than the Senate.

If the Senate will go ahead and do their job like they did not do on repealing at least part of ObamaCare, they will do their job on this, the American people are going to benefit. We are going to see the economy take a big jolt forward and upward, more jobs coming to America.

Nobody gets everything they want. I believe what the President really wanted was going to be best for the country. If we could hold to a 15 percent corporate tax, I wanted to see that across the board for S corporations, C corporations. But as the President knew—I know he knew because we talked about it more than once—that 15 percent would undercut the corporate tax that China has. If we undercut the corporate tax that China has, then it means we were going to be getting manufacturing jobs back to America.

We have had so many manufacturing plants pick up and move to other places—mainly China, Mexico, other places. We need to be manufacturing here.

I know there are those elitists who have been educated with degrees far beyond their intellectual capacity to absorb. They got the degrees, but they didn't get the wisdom. And some have ventured to say: No, we don't need to be a manufacturing country. We have evolved above being these lowly manufacturers. That is for developing countries, not a wonderful country like ours is.

Obviously, they spent too much time in other places than studying history. This is something else I have talked about with the President—he knows it just from his business acumen; I know it from studying history—that any nation that is a powerful nation in the world that cannot manufacture the things that that country needs in a time of war will cease to be a great nation after the next war. And be assured, there will be wars.

Jesus, the wisest to ever walk this planet, said there will always be wars and rumors of war. And that is true because this planet has evil: people who will do evil, countries that will do evil,

people who get jealous when some other country has more freedom, more assets. And there is going to be evil in this world as long as this world exists.

We saw that down in Sutherland Springs. Some lunatics—again, many of them educated well beyond their ability to be wise—had popped off and said, well, if prayer worked, those people would never have been shot in a church where they were praying and worshipping.

As long as people are in this world, there is going to be evil—not that God wants evil to prevail. He doesn't. He doesn't want that any should stumble. But as a parent knows, you could force your child to say, "I love you" or to throw their little arms around your neck, hug you, and say, "I love you." You could force them to do that. It doesn't mean a whole lot. But when you give people the free will to choose to love you, to choose to follow your rules, it is overwhelming to a parent when a child freely chooses to do that.

So we have freedom of choice. Some choose to do evil. Some want governments to be all powerful because, in their lack of wisdom, they think that the government needs to be in control of everything and everybody.

The late Justice Scalia, who could make me laugh—he loved good jokes and stories like I do. There have been a lot of unpleasant memories, a lot of unpleasant fights, a lot of fights that I haven't won, but I stood up for what I believed was right.

When I would get around Justice Scalia, having lunch together or breakfast together, we would get to telling stories and jokes, and he was so clever. It was often hard to find a joke or a story he had not heard, but it was just fun to be around him.

But in one of those, I think it was a lunch that time, he said: You know, back when I was working for the Attorney General—and I don't remember which Attorney General it was back in the 1970s—he said: We had a weekly meeting, and one morning the Attorney General came in, and he said: Well, I was at a cocktail party last night, and for the first time I heard a definition that explained the difference between Democrats and Republicans.

He said: I actually think it is pretty good. I think it is very descriptive.

He said: What I learned was Democrats are people who want to control everybody and everything, and Republicans are people who don't want them to.

Well, I found that rather amusing. Actually, that is pretty accurate. Some people on the Republican side of the aisle go: Why don't we plot and plan as well as the Democrats do? They are always trying to figure out how they get power, how they get over on this and that, and we just want people to live and let live. We want as little government as necessary to keep order but allow people to succeed with no ceiling, no limit.

But to succeed, you also have to have the opportunity to fail, just like Edison did. In the hundreds of things he tried, finding a filament, the element that would heat up and not burn in two to make a light bulb, he knew it would work. Somebody asked him about all those failures, and he said, no, each time he tried something that didn't work, it wasn't a failure. He just learned that that is one less thing that might work.

But Fisher, who came up with the space pen—I love those space pens. The email still goes around that says that Americans spent \$4 million to develop a pen that would work in outer space, government money. Russians just use pencils. Not a dime of government money was used.

With an intellect like Fisher, he knew there had to be a way that you could develop a pen that would write in gravity and with no gravity, underwater, above the air—or above the Earth's atmosphere, so he came up with it. But he knew he was going to have to pressurize a pen, and this is such a cartridge.

So he sealed it, put about 30 pounds of pressure. But the trick was finding an ink that didn't explode out when you put 30 pounds of pressure on it or that was not so thick that it wouldn't work when you tried to write. Eventually, he was able to do that.

Lots of failures, but you have got to allow people a chance to fail if they are going to have a chance to succeed. If the government puts its thumb on the scales, it is not real success, it is not real failure, and, eventually, those cards are going to come falling down.

Well, what we have done today with our tax bill, it is a huge step because I know, Mr. Speaker, most folks here are well aware, it is hard to get a majority agreement on much of anything, but we did today. We had a significant majority that agreed. It isn't perfect. Nothing any human ever does will be, but it moves the ball down the road.

One of the things I love about my friend from Texas, KEVIN BRADY, is I would hear from people back home—and talk to KEVIN. He is open to talking not just to Texans. He will talk to everybody. And I found that with so many members on the Ways and Means Committee. My friend DAVID SCHWEIKERT was always available to answer questions, and he was doing his homework thoroughly.

One of the things that has deeply troubled many Americans, and especially seniors, either seniors in poor health or younger Americans who had severe health problems, is, in the ObamaCare bill that was so unaffordable, it changed the deductibility of medical expenses.

Before, it was, if you had medical expenses, you had a really bad time of it, then our hearts go out to you and we want your life to be a little easier when you are going through so much difficulty with bad health, so the deductibles were any medical expense

over 5 percent of your adjusted gross income.

In order to come up with the billions and billions of dollars that ObamaCare, I would submit, wasted, they had to cut out some of the deductions like that, so they ended up raising the threshold from 5 percent to 7½, 10 percent. So it has been 10 percent. You had to have more than 10 percent of your adjusted gross income in order to deduct it, but we still had a lot of, especially, seniors who had more than that.

I had accountants from home send me information about seniors, particularly seniors who had been paying a great deal of medical expense because, no, Medicare didn't take care of them.

And of course we know AARP jumped on the bandwagon for ObamaCare—not because it was going to be good for the seniors. In fact, it was extremely violent to the finances of seniors and to their health, as well. But AARP was more interested in the massive amount of money they could add to their coffers, even though they are considered a nonprofit. So they jumped on board, and, of course, companies that sold other policies had to pay a 2 percent tax on each policy.

AARP got the sweetheart deal. Their policy they embraced didn't have to pay the 2 percent tax. And I haven't seen the provision, but I am told there was a provision that exempted their executive so they didn't have the normal cap on their executive income.

So the people at the top of AARP, they did great. Seniors really got harmed, losing \$716 billion in cuts to Medicare. But for all those seniors who got harmed, couldn't get the surgery, couldn't get the medical help they need, just keep in mind, AARP was able to sell a lot more policies and make a lot more money even though it did a lot of harm to some seniors. Just remember, AARP came out great out of that.

But nonetheless, for those of us who were very sympathetic to seniors having hundreds of billions of dollars cut from Medicare, they heard the President say: Now, this isn't going to affect you seniors at all. It is only going to cut some of the profits from healthcare providers—basically, what was said.

But many of my seniors in east Texas figured out: Wait a minute. If you are not going to pay the healthcare provider for my medicine, for my surgery, for what I need, then I am not going to be able to get the procedure, the surgery, the healthcare that I need if it is not going to be paid for.

So I have had many seniors talk to me about surgeries being delayed or that they couldn't get the same thing they had before ObamaCare passed.

□ 1430

So we haven't repealed ObamaCare, but in this bill, we repealed the ObamaCare mandate, the individual mandate. That means that some people who were forced to pay a higher income tax—they didn't get one of these ridic-

ulous insurance policies—they are going to have that much money in their own pocket. If they were paying for a policy that they knew was never going to help them out, they won't have to buy that.

And, of course, the Democrats, for all the Main Street media, will say, "Oh, look at how many people don't have insurance," when the truth is so many of those people chose not to buy insurance because they knew it was a terrible deal.

I still want to see a reform of healthcare, a real reform of healthcare, but that would mean getting away from either insurance companies or the government being between us and our doctors, our healthcare providers. The way you do that is that you make it so attractive to put money in your own health savings account—and I expect us to pass something to make it much easier and much more attractive. It is not in this bill. This was a tax bill—but I am still hopeful that we are going to do a reform of healthcare and repeal, at least most of ObamaCare. I had that hope. And I hoped that today was a start, not only toward getting tax reform and getting tax relief for Americans and seeing the economy get going again, but also put back in motion true repeal of ObamaCare and getting healthcare laws in place that will be good for Americans.

But how can you have competitive prices in healthcare if nobody knows what these procedures or medicines cost? You see, you get a notice from the healthcare provider—your insurance company—that something costs \$12,000, but you don't know that the insurance company satisfied that \$12,000 payment demand with an \$800 or \$900 payment. But if you knew that if you were paying cash out of your health savings account, a \$12,000 procedure would only cost \$800, you wouldn't be so big on paying \$2,000 a month to a health insurance company.

And these health insurance companies still don't see that, under ObamaCare, their days are numbered. It was designed to fail. And America gets so mad at health insurance companies because it was built into ObamaCare. Not only were they going to have record profits, like some of them did last year, but they were going to get bailouts on top of their record profits.

It was going to make America so mad at the insurance companies that even conservatives would say: Well, I never thought I would say this, but anything has to be better than what we have with these insurance companies. Why don't we have the government just take over everything?

Then, voila, we then have VA healthcare for all Americans, except much worse than the VA provides, because everybody is forced to be in it.

I was amazed, as an exchange student in the Soviet Union, to see the type of medical care that was in the Soviet Union in the seventies. I just thanked

God that we didn't have that kind of socialized medicine, and we were so much more advanced.

But it was clear that physicians, back in the Soviet Union in the seventies—I am sure there were some that were really dedicated, but, for most, it was an 8-to-4, 9-to-5-type job—the fewer people they could see, the better they liked it. But that meant a lot of people waited in long lines, didn't get seen, had to come back and come back, and they didn't get the procedures that they needed.

Or, like in Canada, a fellow, named Tyler, told me that his dad died of a heart attack after he had been on the list to get bypass surgery for 2 years.

I said: Two years? It really took that long?

He said: Well, they kept moving people in front of him.

I said: Well, now wait a minute. I understand it is a crime to pay or do anything to get yourself moved up the list.

He said: Oh, yeah, that is the way I understand it, too. But we had a board that would pick and choose among the American citizens who would go in front, and they kept putting people in front of my dad, who finally had the heart attack and died because the board kept putting people in front of him.

That goes back to what Sarah Palin said. She called it a death panel. She was speaking with hyperbole, but the truth is—whether you want to call it a death panel or not—they were making decisions over who would get what; that would mean they lived or died in some occasions, or it meant whether they were going to live in pain or live in comfort. These were government boards making these decisions, just like they used to do in the Soviet Union before it fell.

So I see this tax bill today as not only a step in the right direction to get people more money in their own pockets they can use to make the economy grow, but I see it also as a step in the right direction toward reforming healthcare again because we eliminate the individual mandate.

I still would like to see these further reforms, like I am talking about. I put in a bill, I filed years ago, that healthcare providers would have to post, at least at their facility, but certainly online, if they were online—and now it ought to be a requirement—post exactly what you charge an individual paying cash, an individual with Blue Cross, or Aetna, or whatever it is. Let people know exactly what things cost. Don't send a \$15,000 bill for going into the hospital that you know you are going to accept \$1,000 as payment in full from an insurance company. If you are going to accept \$1,000 for a \$15,000 bill, then say it costs \$1,000.

If we could require everybody to post exactly what things cost, they wouldn't be in such an all-fired hurry to make sure that they had insurance, other than catastrophic, really catastrophic insurance. Because instead of

paying \$2,000 a month to an insurance company—\$24,000 a year—well, they would be better off paying \$1,500 as payment in full for \$15,000 in charges.

We still have a good ways to go, but you don't get anywhere until you take that first step, and today was a giant step, in my opinion.

I didn't realize, until I saw this notice from the Farm Bureau, but the headline says: "House Poised to Take up Farm Bureau-Supported Tax Bill." It was good to see that.

Another article from Heritage Action: "House tax plan propels reform forward."

FOX News has an article, by Newt Gingrich: "House and Senate tax plans have more in common than you think." That makes some excellent points.

It is good news all the way around. It is a step in the right direction.

I am hopeful that some of the things we disagree on, we are going to be able to work out with the Senate. One of those things, like I mentioned, the Senate, as I understand it, their bill currently has an allowance for deductions of medical expense beyond 10 percent. Hopefully, we can eventually do better than that and get it back from where ObamaCare put it, maybe back to 5 percent, at some point.

But we have seniors on fixed incomes, and Medicare doesn't cover what they are needing in the way of healthcare, and they are being overwhelmed by medical expense. Once again, I think if we can get some reforms in—it doesn't have to be a total reform of healthcare, but just get some things in there—even if we can't get the total repeal because of the Senate's recalcitrance, at least let's get some reforms to get people the help they need.

I would also like to address the issue of the Roy Moore allegations. Having prosecuted sexual assault crimes, I have even been forced against my will—but you get an order, and you follow the order to defend sexual assault crimes—in one case finding that a trumped-up case against my African-American client was totally bogus, trumped-up, and we were able to prove irrefutably as such.

But sexual assault allegations are a very dangerous thing. We have in America what we call statute of limitations on most crimes. The reason we have statute of limitations on most crimes is because if you are going to be accused of something, it needs to be made in a timely manner, so that if you are going to accuse somebody of committing a crime, they have a chance to find witnesses.

One of the very reasons that there are statutes of limitations on crimes like sexual assault is that if you wait 38 years to accuse somebody of a sexual assault, it is almost impossible to prove exactly where you were. And I have heard some people in the Senate say: Oh, well, there are just so much specifics coming out that it just seems irrefutable.

Well, usually people's memories wane over the period of three to four decades on times and exact places. And I know, from my days as a judge, sent many rapists and sexual assaulters to prison for many years, including life, I was particularly hard on people who committed sexual assault crimes because they violate so much more than just a physical violation. It is an abominable crime.

But we have limitations. So if somebody makes an allegation against you that you did such and such at 2 in the afternoon on such and such afternoon, and it was at this particular location, and these people were not around, I mean, if you put a bunch of specifics in there, within a year, then the individual being charged can go back to his calendar, or her calendar, and see: Okay, on that day, oh, I wasn't even in that city, I was over here in this city, I was in court across town, I was not even where that happened. So I can bring in and show—not just raise a reasonable doubt—but show absolutely for sure that never happened. That is why we have limitations.

I would just encourage people that when they hear alleged factual allegations that occurred decades previously, no matter how many specifics are thrown in, reserve judgment, and give it a chance to get all of the facts in.

That is why, in every single case I have tried as a judge—and there were thousands of felony cases that came before my court—but in every single case I tried, after the prosecution finished, I then turned to the defense for their chance to submit evidence. It is why, after every witness testified for the prosecution, I turned to the defense attorney and gave them a chance to cross examine.

And there were times I heard charges that, in my mind, were so outrageous, but I knew we have a system in place to protect innocent people from spurious allegations, and we have to go through the process, including an appeal, after the trial. And I have reviewed many appeals as an appellate chief justice.

You have got to let the process play out. And any time somebody comes running in and wants somebody tried in the court of public opinion, and they are only going to give them 3 or 4 weeks, then immediately that should be suspect. Not that it can't be proved out as true, but it should immediately be suspect because these people tried to game the system. They didn't want to give enough time for the ones allegedly committing an offense to prepare a defense.

□ 1445

They didn't want to give adequate time to investigate, even after 38 years. How do you go back 38 years later and say: Gee, where was I? I don't have a calendar that goes back that far. I don't know if I was in town, if I was out of the country. I don't know where I was. Gee, it seems like around that

time. Maybe I was here or there. I don't know.

The odds of being able to mount a proper defense three or four decades after something allegedly happened is just almost impossible.

So all you can do to defend yourself—and I am speaking hypothetically. If somebody, hypothetically, made outrageous allegations against you, and, you know, I know I never did that, how do I prove it?

Well, you are not going to be able to find witnesses to say where you were at that specific moment in time because you don't even remember where you were. How will you find a witness that will back you up?

And if you do find a witness who can say, "Oh, I remember that very second," 38 years later, "this is where he was," then that witness becomes suspect because you just don't remember like that.

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that people will allow an election to go forward with the parties the people have chosen and give time for all the facts to come out.

I like Roy Moore, and I appreciate the man of faith that he is. I think the election needs to go forward just as it is. I think we should not intervene in Congress, and we should let the people of Alabama decide, based on proven facts, not on some last-minute attack.

We should give time for all of the facts to come out, not just the facts that have been set up over the last several months, in all likelihood, in preparation for being able to blindside a candidate, so you have all the facts and you can keep slipping stuff out day after day; because it could very well end up just like Ted Stevens' case, where at least one FBI agent and a prosecutor created a case that not only had reasonable doubt about it, but it was absolutely false.

Senator Ted Stevens was not the most lovable guy. He was kind of a crotchety guy when I was around him. It wasn't very often. They accused him of not filing notice about a hundreds-of-thousands-of-dollars gift improvement onto a home he had.

The FBI—at least some in the FBI, as was borne out by the affidavit by an FBI officer who actually had a conscience, not like his superior FBI agent lead investigator. They fabricated evidence. They hid evidence. The evidence that they had gotten when they served warrants, went to his home, took every piece of paper, every bank record, everything he had, computers, all this, raided the bank, got all their information, got any notes and things, he didn't have the evidence to defend himself because the FBI got it all.

A guy named Robert Mueller was the head of the FBI. This was probably the biggest case that went through the FBI while he was Director, at least one of them. He saw to it that the FBI agent that blew the whistle and pointed out that they have evidence that shows that Ted Stevens not only did not get

a free hundreds-of-thousands-of-dollars, \$600,000-, \$700,000-addition to his house, that he paid hundreds of thousands of dollars more than that. Apparently, there was some communication between the contractor and Senator Stevens saying: You are overpaying. Quit overpaying.

Senator Stevens said: No. No. I am strong-willed in the Senate, so I have always got people looking to try to make something up, so I have to overpay.

The man overpaid.

The FBI, under Mueller, fabricated a case. They tried it the week before the election, and there was a reason for that. They tried it the week before the election. They got a conviction. He lost the election, I think it was by 1,200 votes or so.

After he had lost the election, there was no way to rewind that clock. He was out of the Senate. The Democrats got the seat. They sure didn't care that they won the seat based on a lie, a fraudulent case brought by the U.S. Government. They didn't care. They were glad to have the seat.

It is kind of like Senator Harry Reid said after he made false accusations against Mitt Romney that he hadn't paid any taxes, and when he was asked about it later after Mr. Romney lost the election, his response was basically: Well, it worked, didn't it?

He had no remorse for destroying a man's reputation falsely without any evidence or with manufactured evidence, lies. No remorse, just: It worked, because we got the seat.

And I have a feeling that, when the smoke clears and we find all of the evidence that is left after 38 years, we are going to find that there was a problem not as much with Roy Moore as there was with the accusers, but we need to wait and see. Nobody needs to be rushed to trial.

We have a system of government that prevents somebody from being punished by the government, but the fact is the government is being used to try to punish Roy Moore.

Let's say, hypothetically, you were an establishment leader in the Senate and you have been pushing for amnesty. You didn't want illegal immigration stopped, because there are donors that give a lot of money that want illegal immigration to continue. You wanted amnesty, and you know in the Attorney General's Office you have a guy there, regardless of things you disagree on, who has really cracked down on illegal immigration.

You know you have got a guy that just won the primary in a State, and you spent tens of millions of dollars trying to destroy the guy in the primary and it didn't work. He won. So it looks like he is about to win the election, the general election, even though you are in his same party.

I am just thinking hypothetically. Certainly none of this would be true, surely, but, wow, what a great deal if somebody made accusations, true or

not true, against the guy that you tried to destroy with millions of dollars, that, you know, if he is elected, he is going to come in. He is not going to be your best friend because you called him everything in the book; you tried to destroy him.

So, wow, even though he is in your own party, maybe you would be better off if you had a Democrat you feel like you could work with that was more establishment than the guy that you tried to destroy, that, if he would have gotten along with you—probably not now because you went after him so strongly—what if you could have that guy taken out with allegations, whether true or not, and then you could kill a number of birds.

You know that Steve Bannon has said he is going to war after you. Wow. And Bannon went all in to support this guy in his primary and this election, so if his candidate gets destroyed, you have just destroyed his ability to raise money.

And then on top of that, if you could talk the unsuspecting President into talking his Attorney General into leaving that post to try to go to the Senate, wow, you get rid of the guy that has gotten tough on illegal immigration, you get rid of the guy that has been raising money and going against the establishment, and you get rid of the guy that you tried to destroy with tens of millions of dollars even though he was in your own party—I am just saying, hypothetically.

Maybe it would make for a good fiction novel someday, and maybe there is somebody out there writing that novel, but I am just saying, what if. Wow. What a novel piece of fiction that might be some day. Maybe we would see it in a movie someday. Maybe the Senator would even be from the South.

I also know, having been a district judge, I signed everything original. I know there are some judges that don't sign their orders; they just let somebody stamp.

I made clear the day I became a district judge that nobody is stamping my signature on anything; if it is a stamp, it is going to be clear that it is a stamp, that anything that has got to be originally signed, I am going to sign it.

Now, as I understand it, Judge Moore signed things originally, but on other things, on copies—we would put a stamped signature and note that it was a copy. But his, they either stamped or his assistant wrote his signature, and because the assistant's name had initials D.A., put "D.A." out beside his name to denote that he didn't originally sign this. This was the assistant on his behalf. So litigants would normally get a copy and not the original, of course, unless you make multiple originals.

I wondered when I saw in the yearbook the picture of the signature, I thought: DA? I didn't think he was ever a DA.

Well, he wasn't. He was assistant DA. He was a district judge. He was a chief

justice of the supreme court there in Alabama. He was never the DA.

It is interesting, if someone believed that a guy molested their minor daughter and that person later had a divorce pending in that guy's court, I know I would certainly ask for a different court. There is no way I would let a judge who molested my child have any jurisdiction over my divorce. If I had never brought out about the alleged molestation before, I would certainly do it then. People would need to know that the judge in that court, and particularly the judge on my divorce, was a child molester. They would need to know.

If you don't let people know at that point, you are basically an accomplice. You are allowing this assaulter out there to continue whatever he may be doing to others. You need to come forward and report it. It is not a crime not to report it, but it needs to be reported, and certainly if that person goes on the bench.

It must have been quite a realization for Judge Moore when he saw that "D.A." and realized: Somebody has forged what they thought was my signature, when it was really my assistant, and that is why the assistant put "D.A." out there, to denote that I didn't sign that.

Wow. That must have been quite a feeling for the judge.

There is a story from Joel Pollak on November 16, "Gloria Allred's Blunder on Roy Moore's Yearbook Challenge," that talks about that.

There is another story by John Nolte, also November 16, "Journalist Leann Tweeden Accuses Senator Al Franken of Fondling, Kissing Her Without Consent." I don't know where that is going to lead. I don't know whether the same people will demand his ouster or not. Maybe we need to wait and see if the photograph is forged or if it was photoshopped, something like that.

□ 1500

There is just so much going on, but the bottom line is, today, we have taken a big step toward making America great again. It is not the 15 percent tax I had hoped it would be. In fact, people have got to understand that my friend, Steve Moore, who used to be the senior economics editor for The Wall Street Journal, helped President Trump as an economic adviser. Steve told me a number of times that he likes my definition of corporate tax better than any.

But my definition describes what a corporate tax really is, especially the U.S. corporate tax: 35 percent. It is the largest tariff any modern country has ever put on its own goods or services, because, let's face it, when we put a corporate tax on a company, and 35 percent, they are going to have to put that on their products. If they don't collect that tax on top of the cost of the product, they are going to go out of business. That has got to be added to the cost of the goods or services.

When you look at all the businesses and all the huge manufacturing plants in America that have closed down, and you look at what they were doing before they closed down and you deduct that 35 percent corporate tax or, I would submit, tariff, they could have been selling their product competitively not just in America, but probably in places all over the world. Instead of having to close their doors, they could have kept producing and expanding, but for that huge tariff that was put on their own goods.

Most countries are smart enough not to put a tariff on what their own companies make before they ship them out. But we have been doing that.

So why have we been doing that?

Because it was a great way, people in Congress thought, to raise revenue.

You tell people this mean, evil corporation was paying this tax. We really put it over on this corporation. We made them pay all this tax.

No. What you did was add 35 percent to the cost of their products that they had to figure in somehow to cover that, in addition to what it cost to manufacture; and you have made them non-competitive, here or abroad, and that is why they had to close.

That is why I love the idea of either eliminating the tariff or at least getting it down to 15 percent so we undercut the 17 or so percent that China has. If we undercut their tariff on their own goods, goods produced in China, then those manufacturers are coming back.

I have been amazed that reporters have asked, when I would talk about this publicly: But how are you going to make up for all of that lost income?

They didn't understand, yeah, you are not collecting it as corporate tax, but now you are collecting directly from the people. So it is not a hidden, insidious tax. There are more jobs, and they are paying more money, and the economy is growing and hiring more people. There are more jobs, more income, and more income tax, and it is better for everybody.

But the forces of greed around this country and around this town like to try to convince people they are really sticking it to somebody else, when the truth is that the individuals are going to end up paying it, wherever it is, or the company is not going to stay in business. I would rather them stay in business, add jobs, and give raises.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Faso). The gentleman from Texas has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. So in the last 10 minutes I have here, this will be the last session before Thanksgiving Day. I am greatly disturbed that we have so many young people in America who can't explain what Thanksgiving Day is, why it was originally started, who thanks was given to. Many thought it was to the Indians, but it was not.

This is a declaration, May 2, 1778, to troops at Valley Forge: "The Com-

mander in Chief directs that divine service be performed ever Sunday at 11 o'clock in those brigade to which there are chaplains—those which have none to attend the places of worship nearest to them. It is expected that officers of all ranks will, by their attendance, set an example to their men.

"While we are zealously performing the duties of good citizens and soldiers, we certainly ought not to be inattentive to the higher duties of religion. To the distinguished character of patriot, it should be our highest glory to laud the more distinguished character of Muslim"—I am sorry. It says, "Christian."

George Washington said that the highest glory of a patriot soldier would be the more distinguished character of a Christian. It was an order he gave.

So I know people are saying this is totally appropriate now, and they wonder why evil seems to keep growing in America. But as we look where we came from and we look at what prior leaders did to defeat the forces of evil that are here in this world—and will be as long as it is here in this form—it seems like there is a correlation between when the country is praying to God and asking for his protection and blessing, and when evil seems to be growing.

Thomas Jefferson, in 1781, noted, and it is engraved in his memorial: "The God who gave us life gave us liberty. Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God, that they are not to be violated but with his wrath?"

"Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, that His justice cannot sleep forever."

That is Thomas Jefferson.

John Quincy Adams, on September 26, 1810, wrote a letter to his son, the U.S. Minister at Saint Petersburg: "So great is my veneration for the Bible, and so strong my belief that, when duly read and meditated on, it is of all books in the world that which contributes most to make men good, wise, and happy."

Former President nominated Supreme Court by James Madison, and this on March 30, 1863, by Abraham Lincoln, a great Republican. Lincoln said: "It is the duty of nations, as well as of men, to own their dependence upon the overruling power of God to confess their sins and transgressions in humble sorrow, yet with assured hope that genuine repentance will lead to mercy and pardon, and to recognize the sublime truth announced in the Holy Scriptures and proven by all history, that those nations are only blessed whose God is the Lord."

This is Lincoln's written word: "We have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us. And we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were

produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to God that made us.

"It behooves us, then, to humble ourselves before the offended power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness."

That was a national proclamation by Abraham Lincoln. Thank God that a majority of Americans participated in that and prayed to God.

In his second inaugural, he is talking about North and South. It is inscribed on the inside north wall of the Lincoln Memorial. About half to two-thirds of the way through there, in the middle, he is talking about North and South. He said: "Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God. The prayers of both could not be answered. That of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purposes. 'Woe unto the world because of offenses. . . .' Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said 'the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.'"

I want to finish with this from John F. Kennedy. He was talking at the lighting of the Christmas tree; but at a time of Thanksgiving, it is certainly appropriate. He said: "With the lighting of this tree, which is an old ceremony in Washington and one which has been among the most important responsibilities of a good many Presidents of the United States, we initiate, in a formal way, the Christmas season. We mark the festival of Christmas, which is the most sacred and hopeful day in our civilization.

"For nearly 2,000 years, the message of Christmas, the message of peace and good will towards all men, has been the guiding star of our endeavors.

"This morning, I had a meeting at the White House, which included some of our representatives from far-off countries in Africa and Asia. They were returning to their posts for the Christmas holidays. Talking with them, I was struck by the fact that, in the far-off continents, Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists, as well as Christians, pause from their labors on the 25th day of December to celebrate the birthday of the Prince of Peace.

"There could be no more striking proof that Christmas is truly the universal holiday of men. It is the day when all of us dedicate our thoughts to others; when all are reminded that mercy and compassion are the enduring virtues; when all show, by small deeds and large, and by acts, that it is more blessed to give than to receive. It is the day when we remind ourselves that man can and must live in peace with his neighbors, and it is the peacemakers who are truly blessed.

"In this year of 1962, we greet each other at Christmas with some special sense of blessing of the peace."

Mr. Speaker, this period of Thanksgiving that we will have in the next week will, hopefully, be a time when we will come back together more as a nation; when we will bind our hearts in prayer and Thanksgiving and ask for God's protection, as our greatest Presidents did. And I know those prayers will be answered.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward a sitting Senator.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2810) "An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes."

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on November 15, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 1679. To ensure that the Federal Emergency Management Agency's current efforts to modernize its grant management system includes applicant accessibility and transparency, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 17, 2017, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3181. A letter from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Office of Thrift Supervision Regulations received November 15, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3182. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Disability Rights Office, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communica-

tions Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Access to Telecommunication Equipment and Services by Persons with Disabilities [CG Docket No.: 13-46]; Amendment of the Commission's Rules Governing Hearing Aid-Compatible Mobile Handsets [WT Docket No.: 07-250]; Comment Sought on 2010 Review of Hearing Aid Compatibility Regulations [WT Docket No.: 10-254] received November 15, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3183. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism [CC Docket No.: 02-6] received November 15, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3184. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-51, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3185. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-67, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3186. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's Semiannual Report to Congress prepared by the Office of Inspector General for the Board and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau for the six-month period ending September 30, 2017, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3187. A letter from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's semiannual report covering the period of April 1, 2017 through September 30, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3188. A letter from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Farm Credit Administration Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2017, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3189. A letter from the Board Chairman, Audit Committee Chairman, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's consolidated report to the President, pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3190. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the 30th Annual Report of Accomplishment under the Airport Improvement Program for Fiscal Years 2014-2016, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 47131(a); Public Law 103-272, Sec. 1(e) (as amended by Public Law 112-95, Sec. 152(c)); (126 Stat. 34); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk